

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested, for the reasons set forth below. Claims 3-5 and 41-44 have been previously canceled. Claims 1, 19, 27 and 45 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 2, 6-40 and 45-50 remain pending.

Support for the claim amendments can be found on page 9, bottom paragraph, of applicant's specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 6-40, and 45-50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,542,721 to Boesen et al. ("Boesen") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,595 to Lee et al. ("Lee").

Claim 1 recites, in part:

"a set of one or more input mechanisms provided on the second segment, the set of one or more input mechanisms including at least a multi-directional mechanism having a plurality of actuation states, including one or more directional actuation states and a center actuation state corresponding to a central contact of the multi-directional mechanism..."

Lee discloses a portable wireless communications device having four cursor direction keys (Lee, Fig. 3 elements 8.16-8.19, col. 4 lines 18-22). However, nowhere does Lee suggest or disclose "a multi-directional mechanism having a plurality of actuation states, including... a center actuation state corresponding to *a central contact* of the multi-directional mechanism," as recited in Claim 1. At minimum, applicant submits that the cursor direction keys (8.16-8.19) of Lee do not include a center actuation state, and therefore do not correspond to a multi-directional mechanism, as suggested in the Office Action. As stated in the Office Action, Boesen also does not disclose the above-recited limitation. Thus, even if Boesen and Lee could be combined in the manner proposed in the Office Action, such combination would still lack at least the above-recited limitation, and therefore would not have rendered Claim 1, nor dependent Claims

2 and 6-18, obvious.

Claim 19 recites, in part:

“a set of one or more input mechanisms provided on the second segment, the set of one or more input mechanisms including at least a multi-directional mechanism having a plurality of actuation states, including one or more directional actuation states and a center actuation state corresponding to a central contact of the multi-directional mechanism...”

Applicant submits that, for at least the reasons given with respect to Claim 1, neither Boesen nor Lee discloses the above-recited limitation. Thus, even if Boesen and Lee could be combined in the manner proposed in the Office Action, such combination would still lack at least the above-recited limitation, and therefore would not have rendered Claim 19, nor dependent Claims 20-26.

Claim 27 recites, in part:

“wherein the housing assembly is structured to expose a reduced section that has a reduced peripheral thickness when the housing assembly is in the extended position.”

Applicant submits that neither Boesen nor Lee discloses the above-recited limitation, nor is any such disclosure point out in the Office Action. Applicant therefore submits that the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to Claim 27. In particular, applicant submits that neither Boesen nor Lee suggest or disclose a housing assembly “structured to expose a reduced section that has *a reduced peripheral thickness* when the housing assembly is in the extended position,” as recited in Claim 1. Thus, even if Boesen and Lee could be combined in the manner proposed in the Office Action, such combination would still lack at least the above-recited limitation, and therefore would not have rendered Claim 27, nor dependent Claims 28-40, obvious.

Claim 45 recites, in part:

“a set of one or more input mechanisms provided on the second segment, the set of one or more input mechanisms including at least a multi-directional mechanism having a plurality of actuation states, including one or more directional actuation states and a

center actuation state corresponding to a central contact of the multi-directional mechanism...”

Applicant submits that, for at least the reasons given with respect to Claim 1, neither Boesen nor Lee disclose the above-recited limitation. Thus, even if Boesen and Lee could be combined in the manner proposed in the Office Action, such combination would still lack at least the above-recited limitation, and therefore would not have rendered Claim 45, nor dependent Claims 46-50, obvious.

CONCLUSION


A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any questions or comments that the Examiner wishes to direct to Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at (408) 551-6632.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-1914.

Respectfully submitted,

SHEMWELL MAHAMEDI LLP

Date: April 7, 2008



Yipeng Li, Reg. No. 60,595
Tel. 408-236-6640